

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
9 SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
10

11 CELLULAR COMMUNICATIONS  
12 EQUIPMENT, LLC,  
13  
14 v. Plaintiff,  
15 HTC CORPORATION, et al.,  
16 Defendants.

Case No.: 15cv2373-JAH-MDD

**ORDER TRANSFERRING  
MOTION TO COMPEL TO THE  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS  
PURSUANT TO RULE 45(f)**

**[ECF No. 7]**

17 BACKGROUND  
18

19 On November 13, 2015, AT&T Mobility LLC (AT&T) filed a Motion to  
20 Compel Acacia Research Corporation (Acacia) to Produce Patent License  
21 Agreements and Related Documents. (ECF No. 7). The subpoena, issued  
22 under Fed. R. Civ. P. 45, seeks documents from Acacia in connection with a  
23 patent case pending in the Eastern District of Texas. (Case No. 6:13-CV-  
24 00507-KNM). On November 10, 2015, responding to a query by the Court,  
25 Acacia declined to consent to the transfer of this motion to that court. (ECF  
26 No. 6). On November 23, this Court then issued a briefing schedule and

1 advised the parties that the Court would consider transferring this motion to  
2 the court where the matter is pending based upon extraordinary  
3 circumstances under Rule 45(f) after reviewing the briefs. (ECF No. 9).

4 AT&T's brief, including exhibits, consists of approximately 800 pages.  
5 (ECF No. 7). Acacia's opposition brief, including exhibits stands at  
6 approximately 752 pages. (ECF No. 12). AT&T's reply is a manageable 29  
7 pages. (ECF No. 16). AT&T supports transfer of this case for extraordinary  
8 circumstances to the Eastern District of Texas. (ECF No. 16 at 5-6 (the Court  
9 will use the pagination supplied by ECF rather than the original  
10 pagination)). As explained below, this Court finds extraordinary  
11 circumstances and ORDERS this motion transferred to the docket in Case  
12 No. 6:13-CV-00507-KNM in the Eastern District of Texas under Rule 45(f).

### 13 DISCUSSION

14 Fed. R. Civ. P. 45(f) provides:

15 When the court where compliance is required did not issue the  
16 subpoena, it may transfer a motion under this rule to the  
17 issuing court if the person subject to the subpoena consents or  
18 if the court finds exceptional circumstances.

19 The Advisory Committee Notes to Rule 45(f) provides that in the absence of  
20 consent, the court may transfer in exceptional circumstances, the prime  
21 concern being avoiding burdens on local nonparties. *See Fed. R. Civ. P. 45*  
22 *Advisory Committee Notes, 2013 Amendment, Subdivision (f).*

23 Acacia is not local to the Southern District of California. Its offices, the  
24 place where it was served with the instant subpoena, are located in Newport  
25 Beach, California, within the Central District of California. The subpoena,  
26 however, calls for production at the offices of AT&T's counsel in San Diego,

1 which is within 100 miles of Acacia's offices, within the Southern District of  
2 California, as permitted by Rule 45(c)(2)(A). The Court acknowledges that  
3 this Court may be more convenient to Acacia but Acacia is not within the  
4 jurisdictional limits of this Court. It appears that jurisdiction in this Court  
5 was manufactured, albeit lawfully, by counsel for AT&T.

6 Although technically a non-party, Acacia concedes that it is the parent  
7 company to the plaintiff, Cellular Communications Equipment, LLC, ("CCE")  
8 in the underlying case pending in the Eastern District of Texas. (ECF No. 12  
9 at 8). The gravamen of this dispute appears to stem from discovery disputes  
10 between CCE and AT&T regarding documents sought by AT&T which CCE  
11 claims are not in their possession. Consequently, AT&T is seeking those  
12 documents from Acacia, as the parent company. The relationship between the  
13 plaintiff and Acacia suggests that Acacia is entitled to less deference  
14 regarding convenience than a true third party. Acacia appears to have an  
15 interest in the outcome of this litigation.

16 Finally, considering that there have been extensive case management  
17 conferences in which the very discovery sought here has been discussed,  
18 transfer of this motion to the issuing court may serve to avoid inconsistency  
19 in positions and ruling. (*See, e.g., Transcript of Status Hearing, February 26,*  
20 *2014*, ECF No. 7 Exh.17 (in original is Exh. 15)). *See Moon Mountain Farms,*  
21 *LLC v. Rural Community Insurance Co.*, 301 F.R.D. 426, 429 (N.D. Cal.  
22 2014).

### 23 CONCLUSION

24 This Court finds that extraordinary circumstances exist to transfer the  
25 pending Motion to Compel to the docket in *Cellular Communications*  
26 *Equipment, LLC v. HTC Corporation, et al.*, Case No. 6:13-CV-00507-KNM in

1 the Eastern District of Texas under Rule 45(f). The Clerk is ORDERED to  
2 effectuate the transfer and close this case.

3 IT IS SO ORDERED.

4 Dated: December 16, 2015

5   
6 Hon. Mitchell D. Dembin  
7 United States Magistrate Judge  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26